

**Appl. No. 09/807,457**  
**Amdt. dated April 7, 2004**  
**Reply to Office Action of March 9, 2004**

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENT**

This amendment responds to the Office Action of March 9, 2004. The remarks and arguments made in the response to the Office Action of December 5, 2002 are hereby reiterated in incorporated herein by reference.

Claims 1-13, 16-18, 20, 22, 25-30, 32-38, and 40-51 are pending in the application with claims 14, 15, 19, 21, 23, 24, 31, and 39 having been canceled, claims 1-11, 13, 16-18, 20, 22, 25-30, 47, and 50 having been amended, and new claim 51 added.

The Examiner has stated: "The reply filed on March 5, 2003 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s); Applicant's response has failed to address the issues set forth within paragraphs 6 and 8 of the Office action of December 5, 2002. Specifically, with respect to paragraph 8, applicant's response is insufficient to establish that antecedence exists for all claim limitations. For example and as set forth within the Office action, antecedence has not been found for all fiber species of claim 47. With respect to the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection set forth within paragraph 6 of the Office action, applicant has failed to explain how the claim amendments address the issue that enablement has only been provided for the preforms being derived from at least one starting component that is at least trifunctional with respect to isocyanate or hydroxyl groups. Firstly, it is not clear how the language, 'to an extent allowing for crosslinking of the starting components by a polyaddition reaction', addresses the issue, because it is unclear if or to what extent the language relates to the isocyanate or hydroxyl trifunctional requirement. Secondly, the word, 'polyfunctional', is

**Appl. No. 09/807,457**  
**Amdt. dated April 7, 2004**  
**Reply to Office Action of March 9, 2004**

undefined and is met by 'difunctional'; therefore, it is also unclear how this amendment is to address the issues of the rejection."

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection set forth within paragraph 6 of the Office action of December 5, 2002, by the present amendments, the language "to an extent allowing for crosslinking of the starting components by a polyaddition reaction" no longer appears in the claims. Further, the former language "trifunctional or polyfunctional" has been changed to "at least trifunctional". Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to the objection set forth within paragraph 6 of the Office Action of December 5, 2002, Applicant assumes that only those amendments and additions presented in the response filed October 2, 2002 - to which the Office Action of December 5, 2002, was directed - and subsequently, need be addressed here. Support to be found in the specification for those additional features now included in the claims is shown in the following table.

Amendments to Claim:	Support found in specification at:
3	page 6, line 27;
4	page 4, line 9;
7	page 18, line 15;
10	page 10, line 12;
16	Paragraph bridging pages 6 and 7;
25	page 1, line 6;
26	page 7, line 1;
27	page 2, line 12;

**Appl. No. 09/807,457**  
**Amdt. dated April 7, 2004**  
**Reply to Office Action of March 9, 2004**

28	page 4, line 7;
29	page 4, line 7;
30	page 4, line 12; page 5, lines 12,13;
32	page 14, line 24;
33	page 2, line 12;
34	page 4, line 12; page 5, lines 12,13; page 11, line 24; page 13, line 1; paragraph bridging pages 6 and 7
35	page 1, line 6;
36	page 8, lines 4-7; page 11, lines 26-31;
37	page 4, lines 7 and 29; page 5, line 7;
38	page 4, line 12; page 5, line 13; page 10, line 13;
40	page 17, lines 20-26;
41	page 18, line 15;
42	page 11, line 27; page 15, line 17; page 16, line 16;
43	page 13, lines 3-5;
44	page 8, lines 12-18;
45	page 17, line 7;
46	page 10, line 13;
47	page 10, line 20;
48	page 2, line 12;
49	page 9, line 20, to page 11, line 13; and
50	page 13, lines 9-11; page 14, lines 11-16.

**Appl. No. 09/807,457**  
**Amdt. dated April 7, 2004**  
**Reply to Office Action of March 9, 2004**

In view of the current amendments and the above-indicated support in the specification for the current amended claims, it is requested that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance and an early Office Action to that end is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Paul Grandinetti  
Registration No. 30,754  
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP  
1180 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-8403  
Telephone (212) 382-0700